UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,400	04/13/2004	Ralph Bauer	1055-A4363	3239
34456 7590 03/28/2007 LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP 5914 WEST COURTYARD DRIVE SUITE 200 AUSTIN, TX 78730			EXAMINER	
			YOON, TAE H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MOI	NTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Commence	10/823,400	BAUER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tae H. Yoon	1714
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to see the self of the self o	DN. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .	
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	•	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	I53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-52 is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposite and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applica Drity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948)   Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-34, drawn to a coating composition, classified in class 524, subclass 444+.
- II. Claims 35-52, drawn to a method of forming a coating composition, classified in class 423, subclass 600+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and ( are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different inorganic composition such as carbon black, and the aspect ratio of group I is not required in Group II.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, and because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Abel on March 12, 2007 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-34. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 35-52 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 27, 30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "at least about", "greater than about", "less than about", "not less than" and "no more than about" are indefinite. It has to be either "about" or "less than", for example. See Amgen, Ins. V. Chugal Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., 18 USPQ 2d 1016 (fed. Cir. 1991).

3126/07

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-19, 22, 25, 26 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bugosh (US 2,915,475).

Bugosh teaches the instant fibrous bohemite at col. 15, line 13 to col. 16, line 44 (note that 1 millimicron = 1 nm) and in examples. Specific surface area of 200 to 400

m<sup>2</sup>/g is taught at col. 19, lines 15-18. Use of 1-40% of said bohemite in aqueous paints such as polyacrylic esters with or without other emulsifier is taught at col. 29, lines 1-21. Use of a pH 5 or higher for an aqueous dispersion is taught at col. 24, lines 20-31.

Thus, the invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bugosh (US 2,915,475).

The instant invention further recites flow and leveling value, sag resistance value, dry time, low shear viscosity recovery value and pH over Bugosh.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to make an (aqueous) paint having the instantly recited properties in Bogush since such properties are well known to paints which one can buy from home improvement stores absent showing otherwise.

Claims 1-9, 12 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yoshino et al (US 6,576,324).

Yoshino et al teach the instant the instant plate- and needle-shaped boehmite particles in table 1 and a dispersion coating with polyvinyl alcohol thereof at col. 30, lines 26-32 (examples 19-22). Said plate-shaped bohemite inherently possesses the instant secondary aspect ratio, and table 2 shows the instant BET value. Said coating

Application/Control Number: 10/823,400

Art Unit: 1714

composition inherently meets the instant flow and leveling value, sag resistance value,

dry time, low shear viscosity recovery value and pH.

Thus, the invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-12 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over

Yoshino et al (US 6,576,324).

The instant invention further recites different amount of boehmite over Yoshino et

al.

However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of

invention to change the concentration of bohemite In order to obtain different coating

thicknesses or coating times on different substrates in Yoshino et al since such practice

in coating is a prima facie obviousness.

Claims 1-3, 8-11, 13-19, 22 and 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Napier (US

3,357,791).

Napier teaches fibrous bohemite having an aspect ratio of at least 15 (300/20 =

15) and a largest dimension of 30-3000 nm (10 angstroms = 1 nm) at col. 3, lines 4-15

and at col. 7, lines .5-26. Said bohemite inherently possesses the instant BET value.

Use of said fibrous boehmite as a thickener in an aqueous emulsion containing resins is

taught at col. 11, lines 64-71.

Thus, the invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-34 are rejected uunder 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Napier (US 3,357,791) with or without Bugosh (US 2,915,475).

The instant invention further recites acrylic latex paint over Napier. Bugosh teaches use of 1-40% of said bohemite in aqueous paints such as polyacrylic esters with or without other emulsifier is taught at col. 29, lines 1-21.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

utilize the art well known acrylic resin in Napier with or without teaching of Bugosh since
and since Napier teaches coaitns using synthetic resins at col. 11, line 68 and since an
aqueous latex acrylic paint is well known in the art as taught by Bugosh absent showing
otherwise.

The prior art (A2, Anonymous article on internet) filed on December 22, 2005 has been crossed-out since the date (at least a publication year) is missing.

<u>Updated continuation data at the beginning of specification are needed.</u>

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/823,400 Page 8

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1909.

Tae H Yoon Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

THY/March 26, 2007